

R4NGER5 RADIO EPISODE 67



**RECORDING:
SUNDAY 26TH JULY 8PM
GMT/BST**

THINGS THAT MAKE YOU GO, “AAAAAAARRRGGGHHHHH!!!!”

INSIDE THE RIAA



let's brainstorm here,
guys, is there any
way we can just kill
teenagers who download
music

News

The new owners of file-sharing website The Pirate Bay say users will be paid for sharing files -

Thanks Ghost Dog! Global Gaming Factory (GGF) paid 60m kronor (£4.7m) to take over the site. In an exclusive interview with the BBC, GGF's Hans Pandeya said that the only way to beat illegal file-sharing was to make something more attractive. "We are going to set up a system where the file-sharer actually makes money," he said.

According to Mr Pandeya, GGF's chief executive, the business model for The Pirate Bay would be that it continued to be a file-sharing site. The only difference - at least in terms of content - would be that the files would be hosted legally, rather than stolen from copyright holders. "We're a listed company so everything we do has to be legal; content providers need to be paid and have their wishes and demands met," he said.

Mr Pandeya said that one of the biggest hurdles in overcoming illegal file-sharing was that there was zero cost to the users, while legitimate sites required users to pay for content. The only way to make something more attractive than free was to pay users to share files. "More than half of all internet traffic is file sharing and P2P [peer-to-peer] traffic and buying Pirate Bay gives us one of the biggest sources of traffic.

"We can then use this massive network of file-sharers to help [internet service providers] reduce overload. "Let's say a popular song comes out. Rather than a million downloads from a site - which would cause a considerable strain on that ISP - we can take that song and put it out on P2P. "The copyright holder still gets paid, the users still get their file, the ISP doesn't have a million people all grabbing a file and - for the users who share that song - a payment for putting that file on the P2P network."

Mr Pandeya said that while they would be paying content providers and file sharers, there was money to be made from helping ISPs cope with overload. "We've been working with ISPs for over a year and we can cut their costs - when the system becomes overloaded - by 90%. "All ISPs have this problem and it is one we can fix," he said.

The company is also looking at harnessing the storage capacity and processing power of the file-sharing community, creating a powerful grid of P2P-linked computers. "We're talking about next-gen file sharing so you can create revenue from storage and internet traffic optimisation," he said. However, GGF said that the technology to drive this was still in its infancy. "This technology is new. For now, we're outlining our intentions and asking users to have faith," said Mr Pandeya

Link: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/technology/8128551.stm>

Web filters to censor video games **Thanks to relaystationalpha** from Australia!

The Federal Government has now set its sights on gamers, promising to use its internet censorship regime to block websites hosting and selling video games that are not suitable for 15 year olds. Separately, the Communications Minister, Stephen Conroy, has been nominated by the British ISP industry for its annual "[internet villain](#)" award, competing alongside the European Parliament and French President Nicolas Sarkozy.

Australia is the only developed country without an R18+ classification for games, meaning any titles that do not meet the MA15+ standard - such as those with excessive violence or sexual content - are simply banned from sale by the Classification Board, unless they are modified to remove the offending content.

So far, this has only applied to local bricks-and-mortar stores selling physical copies of games, but a spokesman for Senator Conroy confirmed that under the filtering plan, it will be extended to downloadable games, flash-based web games and sites which sell physical copies of games that do not meet the MA15+ standard. This means that even Australians who are aged above 15 and want to obtain the adult-level games online will be unable to do so. . It will undoubtedly raise the ire of gamers, the average age of which is 30 in Australia, according to research commissioned by the Interactive Entertainment Association of Australia.

Colin Jacobs, spokesman for the online users' lobby group Electronic Frontiers Australia, said the Government clearly went far beyond any mandate it had from the public to help parents deal with cyber-safety. He said Australians would soon learn this the hard way when they find web pages mysteriously blocked. "This is confirmation that the scope of the mandatory censorship scheme will keep on creeping," said Mr Jacobs. "Far from being the ultimate weapon against child abuse, it now will officially censor content deemed too controversial for a 15-year-old. In a free country like ours, do we really need the government to step in and save us from racy web games?"

Senator Conroy's spokesman said the filter would cover "computer games such as web-based flash games and downloadable games, if a complaint is received and the content is determined by ACMA to be Refused Classification". All games that exceed MA15+ are deemed to be RC. The filtering could also block "the importation of physical copies of computer games sold over the internet which have been classified RC", the spokesman said.

Ron Curry, chief executive of the IEAA, said the move highlighted the "unacceptable situation" of not having an R18+ classification for video games. The industry has been fighting for changes to classification laws for years. "It's through the introduction of an R18+ classification that adults will have access to age appropriate material and parents will have the full tool kit to understand the suitability of content for their children," he said.

Mark Newton, an ISP engineer and internet filtering critic, said the move to extend the filtering to computer games would place a cloud over online-only games such as World of Warcraft and Second Life, which aren't classified in Australia due to their online nature.

He said the online distribution of such games has historically been exempt from customs controls on RC material because they have only ever covered physical articles. "That exemption is the only reason why multi-player games with user-generated environments are possible in this country; without it, it'd only take one game user anywhere in the world to produce objectionable content in

the game environment to make the Australian Government ban the game for everyone," said Newton.

Nine ISPs are trialling the web censorship plan, which will block all content that has been "refused classification" by ACMA. Results of the trials are due to be published in July.

In Britain, Senator Conroy was nominated for the annual internet villain award "for continuing to promote network-level blocking despite significant national and international opposition", George White, press officer with Britain's Internet Services Providers' Association, said. "We would be delighted if Mr Conroy wishes to attend the Awards and collect the trophy should he win," Mr White said. Senator Conroy's spokesman refused to comment on the award.

Link: <http://www.smh.com.au/digital-life/games/web-filters-to-censor-video-games-20090625-cxrx.html>

The German parliament passed a bill Thursday imposing censorship of pornographic websites justified by the need to protect children. Thanks T.Hatt!

The legislation was proposed by a coalition of German social democratic and conservative parties. It requires the country's federal criminal investigators to maintain a list of websites accused of containing child pornography and to distribute it to German ISPs, which will then be required to block queries to those websites with a stop sign. In its present form, the bill requires only that ISPs display the warning sign. Users will still be able to access the flagged websites, but they will be advised that viewing child pornography is illegal. German legislators also bowed to criticism by adding a sunset clause that will see the law expire in three years.

The bill drew strong protests from German Internet users including hackers, digital freedom activists, bloggers and social networkers. It triggered an online petition signed by more than 130,000 individuals, 80,000 more than the number required for the petition to be heard on the floor of the German parliament. The bill also requires the German chief privacy commissioner to periodically review the website block list, but the incumbent official has already balked at that.

Critics have proven that there are more effective, less intrusive ways of suppressing child pornography, such as emailing the web hosting companies involved to get the objectionable content removed from the interweb almost immediately. Furthermore, small ISPs might not have sufficient resources to comply with the infrastructure demands of the plan.

The worst fear, of course, is that once the German government has an Internet censorship apparatus in place, it will be deployed by authoritarian elements of the government, political parties or security agencies to repress freedom of political expression, dissent and free access to information.

Link: <http://www.theinquirer.net/inquirer/news/1356941/german-parliament-passes-internet-censorship>

DoD Training Manual: Protests are "Low-Level Terrorism" **Thanks Peekok!**

The Department of Defense is training all of its personnel in its current Antiterrorism and Force Protection Annual Refresher Training Course that political protest is "low-level terrorism." The Training introduction reads as follows:

"Anti-terrorism (AT) and Force Protection (FP) are two facets of the Department of Defense (DoD) Mission Assurance Program. It is DoD policy, as found in [DoDI 2000.16](#), that the DoD Components and the DoD elements and personnel shall be protected from terrorist acts through a high priority, comprehensive, AT program. The DoD's AT program shall be all encompassing using an integrated systems approach." The first question of the Terrorism Threat Factors, "**Knowledge Check 1**" section reads as follows:

Which of the following is an example of low-level terrorism activity?

- Attacking the Pentagon
- IEDs
- Hate crimes against racial groups
- Protests

The "correct" answer is Protests.

The ACLU learned of this training and on June 10, 2009 [sent a letter](#) to Gail McGinn, Acting Under-Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, objecting to their training all DoD personnel that the exercise of First Amendment rights constitutes "low-level terrorism."

For those who have worried about a [trend](#) - evident, for example, in the USA PATRIOT Act, the universal and ongoing government surveillance of all of Americans' electronic communications that began in February of 2001 ([seven months before 9/11](#)), the global war on a tactic (terrorism), therefore making this war unending, the unprecedented *pre-emptive* arrests of protestors at the [2008 Republican National Convention](#) with those protesters being charged as "domestic terrorists," the justifications for torture, pre-emptive wars of aggression, ongoing occupations, American gulags such as Bagram, suspension of habeas corpus, and "[prolonged detention](#)" for acts someone *might* commit, not what they have done, FBI et al infiltration of protest groups and the government's acknowledged use of undercover agents ([agents provocateurs](#)) in said infiltration, thus giving the government under the rubric of fighting domestic terrorism *unrestrained and unsupervisable power* to suppress legitimate political activities, the unleashing and justifications for Christian fascists to murder those they do not like (such as the assassination of Dr. George Tiller and the killing at the Holocaust Museum a few days ago) - this news adds further [fuel to the fire](#).

These are not items from some famously vilified, non-US dictatorial regime. These are items from the good ole USA, land of the free and home of the brave. Just how brave are we now? How free are we still? Are we brave enough to be "winter soldiers" and stand up against these fascist moves? Or will we go down in history in infamy, the way the "Good Germans" of the 1930s and 1940s did?

Link: <http://www.boingboing.net/2009/06/22/us-department-of-def.html>

WASHINGTON — A strip search of a 13-year-old girl by officials at her middle school violated the Constitution, the [Supreme Court](#) ruled Thursday in an 8-to-1 [decision](#). Thanks Kevin and Schneelocke!

The student, Savana Redding, had been suspected of bringing prescription-strength ibuprofen to the school, in Safford, Ariz. Justice [David H. Souter](#), writing for the majority, said a search of Ms. Redding's backpack and outer garments did not offend the Fourth Amendment's ban on unreasonable searches. But the pills in question, each no stronger than two Advils, did not justify an "embarrassing, frightening and humiliating search," Justice Souter wrote. School officials ordered Ms. Redding, whom another girl had accused of giving her drugs, to strip to her bra and underpants and to pull them away from her body, exposing her breasts and pelvic area. No drugs were found.

The case attracted national attention and gave rise to an intense [debate](#) over how much leeway school officials should have in enforcing zero-tolerance policies for drugs and violence. Some parents were outraged by the intrusiveness of the search, while others worried about tying the hands of school officials charged with keeping their children safe. The case also revealed a gender fault line at the court. In an unusual [interview](#) about a pending case, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg told USA Today in the spring that judging from their comments at the [argument](#), her colleagues, all men, had failed to appreciate what Ms. Redding had endured. "They have never been a 13-year-old girl," Justice Ginsburg said. "It's a very sensitive age for a girl. I don't think that my colleagues, some of them, quite understood." In the end, Justice Ginsburg's view of the constitutionality of the search prevailed.

But the decision did not offer particularly clear guidance to school personnel, who were told only to take account of the extent of danger of the contraband in question and whether there is good reason to think it is hidden in an intimate place. So the upshot of the decision in a practical sense may well be to eliminate strip searches in schools. "A number of communities have decided that strip searches in schools are never reasonable and have banned them no matter what the facts may be," Justice Souter said, citing a regulation of the New York City Department of Education banning such searches in all circumstances.

The court stopped short, however, of allowing Ms. Redding's lawsuit to go forward against the assistant principal who ordered the search and the two female school officials who conducted it. The state of the law at the time of the search, in 2003, was too murky to allow the officials to be sued, Justice Souter said. A separate claim against the school district based on its practices and policies was not part of the district's appeal to the Supreme Court and will proceed.

Justices Ginsburg and [John Paul Stevens](#) would have allowed the claims against individual school officials to go forward. "This is, in essence, a case in which clearly established law meets clearly outrageous conduct," Justice Stevens wrote.

Only Justice [Clarence Thomas](#) would have ruled the search constitutional. “Preservation of order, discipline and safety in public schools is simply not the domain of the Constitution,” he wrote. Justice Thomas also said Thursday’s decision provided the nation’s students a court-sanctioned hiding place. “Redding would not have been the first person to conceal pills in her undergarments,” he wrote. “Nor will she be the last after today’s decision, which announced the safest places to secrete contraband in school.”

Ms. Redding, now 19, said in a telephone interview that she was “pretty excited” by the decision. “It makes me feel good,” she said, “that they recognized that it was against my rights and that it most likely won’t happen to anyone else.” A lawyer for the school district said that the decision “offers little clarification” concerning when such searches are allowed and that it could have dangerous consequences.

The decision unduly limits “the ability of school officials to protect students from the harmful effects of drugs and weapons on school campuses,” the lawyer, Matthew W. Wright, said in a statement. “We can only hope that this decision does not compound the problem further,” Mr. Wright said, “by emboldening more students to smuggle such contraband into the nation’s schools.”

The majority made clear that school searches were subject to less exacting constitutional standards than those conducted by the police. Where the police must generally have probable cause to conduct searches, school officials need have only “a moderate chance of finding evidence of wrongdoing,” Justice Souter wrote. Nor did the majority take issue with the zero-tolerance rule at Safford Middle School.

“There is no need here either to explain the imperative of keeping drugs out of schools, or to explain the reasons for the school’s rule banning all drugs, no matter how benign,” Justice Souter wrote. “Teachers are not pharmacologists trained to identify pills and powders, and an effective drug ban has to be enforceable fast.” But a search of the sort Ms. Redding underwent must be supported by more than another student’s accusation, Justice Souter said.

“The content of the suspicion,” he wrote, “failed to match the degree of the intrusion,” particularly given “the nature and limited threat of the specific drugs” at issue. At the argument of the case, *Safford Unified School District v. Redding*, No. 08-479, in April, Justice Stephen G. Breyer suggested that the search of Ms. Redding was in some ways comparable to her changing into gym clothes.

Thursday’s decision took a different approach. “Changing for gym is getting ready for play,” Justice Souter wrote. “Exposing for a search is responding to an accusation reserved for suspected wrongdoers and fairly understood as so degrading” that many schools never allow the practice.

Link : http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/26/us/politics/26scotus.html?_r=3&hp

Married Labour MPs Ann and Alan Keen have come under fire for claiming thousands of pounds on a second home near Parliament, while their designated main home is only 10 miles away. Now a group of people has taken direct action by squatting in the main home they say has been left unoccupied. The BBC's Lisa Hampele paid them a visit.

The remnants of last night's barbecue with the neighbours are in the front garden - some cold sausages and decorations on the pot plant. The squatters have a legal notice on the front door which says they have rights. They can stay. The six men and four women moved into the west London property over the weekend and now they are adamant they will not budge. "We've paid for their home with our taxes - so we're going to use it," Bob says as he opens the front door to let me in. "You can see the Keens aren't using it." The house is in Mrs Keen's Brentford and Isleworth constituency. There are missing floors, pipes poking through half-built walls and sacks of cement dotted about. The couple have not lived here for many months, some say almost a year, but Mrs Keen describes it as her main home. The Keens claimed almost £140,000 over four years in expenses for their second home close to Parliament. A bed sheet is hanging out of the window of their main home. In big, black writing the banner says: "Reclaiming Your Taxes."

Another reads: "500,000 homeless - One million empty homes." Serg, Joe, Andy and Bob were at the house when I visited. They are all local and moved in after an angry resident told them the house was empty. "It's wrong for taxpayers to be paying for MPs to have two homes, when there are so many people who need somewhere to live," Serg says, making sure I do not fall down the hole by the stairs as we edge past into the half-finished kitchen area. Pieces of plasterboard rest against the door. Joe's back now - he had just popped into a neighbour's house to use the internet and download details of Ann Keen's expenses. He is not impressed. Another neighbour knocks on the door with some milk. "Good on you," he shouts. It is all very friendly. Bob tells me constituents have complained that letters posted here do not get to the MP. A man in a smart white hat and an accent to match stops his bike. He stood against Ann Keen as the Green candidate back in the 1990s. He is another one who is all for the squatters. They sit on the front wall and have a chat, agreeing that taxpayers should not be footing the bill like this.

A council source told the BBC that the property, which is 10 miles from Westminster, had remained empty for seven months. And in a letter obtained by the BBC, the local council has told the Labour couple that "urgent action" is required from them to explain why their main home is unoccupied. The Keens say they have lived in the house for 22 years and insist it is being renovated. In a statement on Monday they said: "It is our home and has been very special to us for a long time. We find it extremely upsetting to know that our house is occupied by squatters who appear to believe that they are entitled to do what they wish in our property."

Kevin says: Can I get a Hoo-raa?

Link: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8124763.stm>

In fighting knife crime news, thanks to Schneelocke!

The first “anti-stab” knife is to go on sale in Britain, designed to work as normal in the kitchen but to be ineffective as a weapon. The knife has a rounded edge instead of a point and will snag on clothing and skin to make it more difficult to stab someone. It was invented by industrial designer John Cornock, who was inspired by a documentary in which doctors advocated banning traditional knives. Mr Cornock, 42, from Swindon, said that the knife will cut vegetables, but will make it almost impossible to stab someone to death and will reduce the risk of accidental injuries.

He said: “It can never be a totally safe knife, but the idea is you can’t inflict a fatal wound. Nobody could just grab one out of the kitchen drawer and kill someone.” The knife is expected to sell for around £40-50 and has been tested with “very favourable” results by the Home Office’s Design and Technology Alliance - set up to research products that can deter crime.

Link : <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/crime/article6501720.ece>

Schneelocke says: Definitely one of the stupidest things I've ever seen; having a point on a knife is quite useful, both in the kitchen and elsewhere. And does anyone *seriously* advocate banning "traditional" knives? I'd call Poe's Law[1] on that, but in the UK these days, you never know.

Note from V : Poe's Law makes the clear point that it is hard to tell parodies of fundamentalism from the real thing, since they both seem equally insane.

Link to wikipedia page - http://rationalwiki.com/wiki/Poe%27s_Law **Thanks Schneelocke!**

Law enforcement is an increasingly challenging job, so GP likes to see police officers well trained and well-informed. Thanks Schneelocke!

Moreover, with an uptick in the number of incidents in which alleged pedophiles have made contact with their victims through online games, this is clearly a venue that the police need to be able to understand and deal with effectively when the need arises. That being said, we hope these comments by an investigator with the Mid-Missouri Internet Crimes Task Force were somehow misquoted or taken out of context: "There is no reason an adult should have [Animal Crossing: City Folk]," says Andy Anderson, Mid-Missouri Internet Crimes Task Force. "Animal Crossing" and similar games are likely doing it for the wrong reasons."

Actually, there are many adults who enjoy the *Animal Crossing* series.

GP: Personally, I haven't had time to get into AC: *City Folk*, but I enjoyed the original *Animal Crossing* on GameCube and once passed an entire Philly-LAX flight playing AC: *Wild World* on the DS. So, it's kind of disheartening to see adult ownership of *Animal Crossing* eyed with suspicion by the police.

Link : <http://www.gamepolitics.com/2009/03/17/cybercop-no-good-reason-adults-own-animal-crossing>

Pharmacists can't refuse Plan B pill, appeals court says Thanks Schneelocke!

A pharmacy owner and workers had sued Washington state to block a requirement that they stock and sell the 'morning after' contraceptive. Pharmacists are obliged to dispense the Plan B pill, even if they are personally opposed to the "morning after" contraceptive on religious grounds, a federal appeals court ruled Wednesday. In a case that could affect policy across the western U.S., a supermarket pharmacy owner in Olympia, Wash., failed in a bid to block 2007 regulations that required all Washington pharmacies to stock and dispense the pills.

Family-owned Ralph's Thriftway and two pharmacists employed elsewhere sued Washington state officials over the requirement. The plaintiffs asserted that their Christian beliefs prevented them from dispensing the pills, which can prevent implantation of a recently fertilized egg. They said that the new regulations would force them to choose between keeping their jobs and heeding their religious objections to a medication they regard as a form of abortion.

Ralph's owners, Stormans Inc., and pharmacists Rhonda Mesler and Margo Thelen sought protection under the 1st Amendment right to free exercise of religion and won a temporary injunction from the U.S. District Court in Seattle pending trial on the constitutionality of the regulations. That order prevented state officials from penalizing pharmacists who refused to dispense Plan B as long as they referred consumers to a nearby pharmacy where it was available. On Wednesday, a three-judge panel of the U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals lifted the injunction, saying the district court was wrong in issuing it based on an erroneous finding that the rules violated the free exercise of religion clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Other constitutional challenges are pending with the district court, which had been waiting for the 9th Circuit ruling on the injunction, said Chad Allred, a Seattle lawyer whose firm represents Stormans and the pharmacists. In anticipation of the injunction being vacated, Stormans and the two pharmacists secured an agreement with the state that it would not pursue sanctions against them until the other issues were decided at trial, Allred said. "We're still optimistic that we're doing the right thing and that we will prevail in the end," said Kevin Stormans, who with his father and two siblings owns the supermarket at the center of the legal challenge. The 9th Circuit ruling, however, means that the requirement that pharmacies stock and dispense Plan B takes immediate effect, said Joyce Roper, an assistant attorney general for Washington state.

The Alliance Defense Fund, a Christian legal organization that filed the suit on behalf of Stormans, didn't return a call for comment. Although the courts have yet to pronounce judgment on other aspects of the lawsuit, the unanimous ruling on the free-exercise clause could portend further judgments, as the case moves forward, that a patient's right to timely medication supersedes a pharmacist's personal convictions. The three 9th Circuit judges found common ground despite differing outlooks: Two conservatives named to the court by President George W. Bush and a liberal named by President Clinton made up the panel. The right to freely exercise one's religion "does not relieve an individual of the obligation to comply with a valid and neutral law of general applicability," the 9th Circuit panel wrote. "Any refusal to dispense -- regardless of whether it is motivated by religion, morals, conscience, ethics, discriminatory prejudices, or personal distaste for a patient -- violates the rules," the panel said.

Link: www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-pill-ruling9-2009jul09,0,6469894.story

The fight for the right to object. Thanks Schneelocke!

It is, in many respects, the stuff of childish playground spats - calling one another names, the tossing out of verbal insults. But gather in the British government's definition of 'a group' - more than one person - and toss those same insults about and you could be deemed by police to be in breach of Section four of the Public Order Act 1986.

Gather in that same group and decline to inform the police in advance and you are in violation of Section 14 of that same act - the part that requires you to inform the authorities in advance if you plan to protest. Go a step further and refuse to give your name and address should a passing police officer ask for it and you could be deemed to be in violation of Section 50 of the Police Reform Act of 2002.

It goes on.

Bring a camera along and, according to the police, you could be in violation of Section 76 of the Counter Terrorism Act 2008, which the police say prohibits you from photographing or filming them. Should the police 'anticipate' that you might turn violent, they can invoke Section 60 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 to stop and search you without reason or provocation.

Section 44 of the Terrorism Act of 2000 goes even further, offering police sweeping powers to designate stop and search areas in which they can search anyone, anywhere at anytime without any grounds or suspicion. All of Greater London is now deemed to be a designated stop and search area.

These are just some of the legislative powers that have been granted to police in recent years - powers which both protesters and civil rights campaigners say have eroded what many in the UK consider to be basic democratic rights. Anna Fairclough, legal officer for Liberty, said that in their view, powers laid out in vague, over-reaching laws are being misused by police against law-abiding protesters - all without adequate accountability. "Our concern is the combination with which these increasingly broad legislative powers which can be - and are - routinely being used by police."

In the case of whether or not it is illegal to photograph the police, Ms Fairclough said the law - aimed at preventing soldiers and others from being targeted by terrorists - is being misused by police who do not want their own actions scrutinised. The police, both in London and nationally, defend the use of these laws to both monitor and control protests.

Meredydd Hughes, the Chief Constable of South Yorkshire, speaking to Panorama on behalf Mr Hughes said the police are there to enforce the laws set by parliament.

"If our tactics are considered to be unlawful or inappropriate then they can be changed...that's a matter of law and custom in the UK."

Liberty's Ms Fairclough agrees. She said in many instances, it is up to the government to amend and clarify vague laws, not leave it to frontline officers to interpret them. "This is the result of a knee-jerk response by the government because it wants to look very tough on terrorism," she said of the

legislation that has been passed. "The police now have so many overbroad powers it becomes increasingly unlikely that the average copper on the street will be able to keep up with them and apply them lawfully." She said the G20 protests - and the resulting inquiries into the tactics employed by police - have signalled a turning point. "I think there is an increasing awareness following the G20, and while it was a terrible time, it has also turned into an opportunity to raise issues," she said, specifically pointing to what protesters say is the longstanding frontline police tactic of not wearing their identification numbers

Link: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8131637.stm>

Land of the free, home of the brave! Thanks Schneelocke!

Husband and wife owners of a California company that distributed pornographic materials over the Internet have been each sentenced to one year and one day in prison, the U.S. Department of Justice announced.

Extreme Associates and owners Robert Zicari, also known as Rob Black, 35, and his wife, Janet Romano, aka Lizzie Borden, 32, pleaded guilty in March to a felony charge of conspiracy to distribute obscene material through the mail and over the Internet. They were sentenced Wednesday.

The couple, in their plea agreement, acknowledged distributing three videos through the mail and six video clips over the Internet to western Pennsylvania. They forfeited the domain name, Extremeassociates.com, as part of their plea agreement, in U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. The company is now defunct.

"Extreme Associates produced and distributed sexually degrading material that portrayed women in the most vile and depraved manner imaginable," U.S. Attorney Mary Beth Buchanan, of the Western District of Pennsylvania, said in a statement. "These prison sentences affirm the need to continue to protect the public from obscene, lewd, lascivious or filthy material, the production of which degrades all of us."

The DOJ began cracking down on Internet-based pornography in 2003, and the agency established an Obscenity Prosecution Task Force in 2005.

Extreme Associates was the subject of a PBS Frontline documentary entitled "American Porn," which aired nationwide in February 2002. That program showed nonsexually explicit portions of the filming of a video. Undercover U.S. Postal inspectors then visited the Extreme Associates Web site and purchased videotapes. Inspectors also downloaded several obscene video clips, the DOJ said.

In August 2003, a federal grand jury in Pittsburgh returned a 10-count indictment against Extreme Associates for violating federal obscenity statutes. In January 2005, a district court judge dismissed the indictment, saying that the federal obscenity statutes were unconstitutional. The government appealed, and Buchanan argued the case in October 2005 before the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

In December 2005, the appeals court reversed the decision of the district court and held that the federal statutes regulating the distribution of obscenity do not violate any constitutional right to privacy. The case was then remanded back to the district court.

Schneelocke says: The only thing that degrades us here is the existence of cunts like Mary Betch Buchanan.

Link: http://www.pcworld.idg.com.au/article/309771/couple_gets_prison_time_internet_obscenity

Usenet.com lawyers [lost their copyright infringement](#) case to the music industry on Tuesday and are now preparing for a federal court to assess damages. The judgment could be hundreds of millions of dollars. **Thanks Macavity!**

In the long list of copyright cases brought by the [Recording Industry Association of America](#), this one stands out for all the drama it provided, and depending on which side you talk to, the amount of precedent-setting decisions involved. Usenet.com lawyers argue the presiding judge diluted the power of the landmark 1984 Betamax case. RIAA attorneys sigh, and say their opponents are just trying to inflame the public.

In what became a provocative sideshow during the proceedings, the RIAA alleged that Usenet.com destroyed evidence and prevented employees from being questioned by RIAA lawyers, going so far as shipping some of them off on extended trips to Europe. Presiding U.S. District Judge Harold Baer, of the Southern District of New York, was unamused and sanctioned Usenet.com.

Usenet.com is a company that enables users to access the Usenet network, an early [electronic discussion forum](#) and formerly popular way to share binary files. [In October 2007](#), the RIAA filed suit against Usenet.com, which charges up to \$19 for access "to millions of MP3 files and also enables you to post your own files the same way and share them with the whole world."

That was how Usenet.com advertised itself and while the pitch may have lured customers, it certainly didn't help in the defense against a copyright suit. Baer ruled in favor of the RIAA on Tuesday and found Usenet.com liable for direct, contributory, and vicarious infringement. Sometime in the next three weeks, the judge will hear from both sides as to what they think damages should be and what steps Usenet.com must take to prevent copyright violations.

Both sides agree that there is a vast amount of infringing material that Usenet.com helps make available. Baer could assess damages anywhere from \$750 per infringing work to \$30,000. The total award to the RIAA theoretically could be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Already, one of the three defendants in the case has filed bankruptcy. There are serious questions about whether Usenet.com can survive a significant damage award. "The court needs to balance the fact that you can't simply shut us down," said Baker, "because the technology itself has substantial non-infringing uses. On that everyone agrees."

For other media services accused of [copyright violations](#), such as YouTube and music start-up Project Playlist, nothing in the case is more important than the judge's decision to prevent Usenet.com from arguing a Betamax defense, Baker said. The Betamax case refers to the Supreme Court decision in Sony Corp. of America vs. Universal City Studios, which decided that makers of video recorders could not be held liable for copyright infringement.

That ruling has been interpreted to mean that companies can't be held liable if the devices they create are "capable of significant non-infringing uses." It is a decision that tech companies have long relied on to shield them against copyright complaints. But the RIAA now has Betamax in its crosshairs, according to Baker. Judge Baer said, in his 38-page decision, that the chief difference between Usenet.com and Sony in the Betamax case is the latter company cut ties with customers once they purchased a VCR. After that, Sony had no part whatsoever in illegal acts committed by customers. Usenet.com, on the other hand, maintains a relationship with customers. For

Usenet.com subscribers, the company is the gatekeeper to the Usenet network. "You do see a whittling down of the (Betamax) policy unfortunately," said Baker, with the law firm of Fulbright and Jaworski. "I think because the court found that we were more actively involved in our users than they were in the Sony case itself. Yes, we maintained a relationship with our clients but we tried to point out Sony also maintained a relationship by keeping up with customers through warranties, and providing 800 numbers and by contacting their customers. In this situation, the court may have gone too far in finding that Sony Betamax was not available to us as a defense."

Another precedent set by Baer, according to Baker, is that distributing material within a closed network was a violation. The RIAA's chief of litigation denied in an interview that there is much new, if anything, in Baer's decision. "Baker is inflaming your readers by suggesting that Baer went further than he did," said Jennifer Pariser, the RIAA's senior vice president of litigation.

"You only need to look at the decisions that we have prevailed in thus far against peer-to-peer services," Pariser said. "In all of those cases, the court must have determined that Betamax didn't apply because you know for sure that every defendant always tries to say 'We're immune from liability because of Sony Betamax.'"

She noted that decisions in such cases from Aimster to Napster have all said that just because a service is capable of non-infringing uses, doesn't automatically protect it from liability. In Napster, for example, the company asserted the Betamax case in its defense but U.S. District Judge Marilyn Patel ruled against the music-sharing service because the defendant had knowledge of copyright theft on the site. "It is simply untrue that this case is unprecedented," Pariser said.

As for the way the files are distributed on Usenet, she also disagreed that Baer's findings were anything new. "It's true that this particular technology has not been observed before, but you can think of that as analogous to the transferring from one file to another on a peer-to-peer network, which the Supreme Court in Grokster said was infringement. The fact that it goes from a peer to another peer doesn't mean it's not copyright infringement." What Baer said, Pariser continued, "is that the transfer of the file from this defendant's server to a Usenet.com paid subscriber is unauthorized distribution."

How about the shenanigans Usenet.com was accused of committing with respect to evidence and discovery? Baker said the RIAA's favorite tactic in these sort of cases is to "bombard defendants with discovery requests" and that his clients aren't very sophisticated. They were doing their best to comply. He added that the RIAA is trying to use this case to scare other Usenet services.

Pariser said that in all the similar cases the RIAA has pressed, when it came to Usenet.com "the discovery misconduct was unprecedented."

As for what the RIAA is going to ask for in damages, Pariser said the RIAA hasn't come to a dollar figure yet but "certainly there's no question that Usenet.com caused multimillion dollars worth of damage."

Link: http://news.cnet.com/8301-1023_3-10277160-93.html?tag=nl.e703

R4nger5 News / Feedback

- Sorry about no shows for the past couple of weeks – been having adventures. Went sailing and went to the r4nger5 invasion of London immediately after.
- Thanks to all the people who have commented on my video blog, BTW – more stuff soon
- Rundown on what happened at the r4nger5 invasion of London

Feedback from Ghostdog : Boycott the Hilton!

My girlfriend works for this company and treats her like shit. In all her career as a waitress, she has never had such poor treatment. Take today; She just told me she has been sick twice tonight and rather than being sent home she will be working past midnight now instead of 11. I have decided than anyone with any compassion should boycott this franchise until their staff treatment improves.

Half Time Music

- Track 1 – **Cyanide Mindeye** by **Smokesuit** from www.podsafeaudio.com
- Track 2 – **Is Dead** by **Patient Zero** from the album **Schizophrenia**
- Track 3 – **Mancek** track

Discussion : What will be the final straw before the backlash against the powers that be?

Links

- www.rantmedia.ca
- www.wogrant.com
- www.wognetwork.com
- www.standovermedia.tk
- www.stormthewire.tk
- www.empowerthyself.com
- www.Kevinisageek.org
- www.r4nger5.com
- www.r4nger5blog.tk
- **Irc.freenode.net** then **#r4nger5**

www.ovguide.com – need to find a video on the internet? – take some of the toil out of your search – really good search engine for watching streamed video content

<http://www.rogersmushrooms.com> Great link for identifying mushrooms – I can't remember who sent this to me – might have been someone at work. If not, apologies.

<http://tiltshiftmaker.com/> Turn your photos into images that really look like models. **Thanks to Marl**

Reccomedia

Into the Wild – Great Movie about a guy called Chris MacCandless (or Alexander Supertramp, if you want to use the name he took while on the road) who just rejected the idea of a normal life and explored much of America and finally settled in Alaska, living by his wits, Killed by misidentifying a plant just 113c days into his Alaskan experience. Available to buy on DVD , or possibly out there on the internet.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L9jdlm7grCY> self contained environments – food for thought – thanks to **Daryl174**, who left the pointers to this video on my video blog

http://www.cracked.com/article_14990_what-monkeysphere.html The Monkeysphere! possibly the most compelling psychological behaviour model ever devised! Thanks Schneelocke! If you only read one on line article this year – go for this one – a lot of things will suddenly make sense.

Schneelocke says : You may know Cracked; for the most part, it used to be a satirical magazine in the vein of MAD Magazine, and in fact, that's about the only thing I knew about it when I came across this article (that, and the fact that the late great Don Martin, who used to work for MAD Magazine for the longest time, switched to Cracked in the late 80s, turning from "MAD's maddest artist" into "Cracked's crackedest artist").

So imagine my surprise when I saw this article - written with a funny twist, that's sure, but REALLY insightful and worth reading. Seriously, check it out; it's somewhat on the longish side, but it's stunning, and it'll give you a better insight into human society in general; it certainly did for me, and even though I was at least vaguely aware of many of the points it covers, it took them all, presented them in a fresh form and worked out the connection and put it all into one coherent piece of text.

About the only weak point is that it doesn't really touch upon ethics; it'd have been interesting to discuss philosophical systems of ethics in the light of the monkeysphere and try to work out both what an ethical system would have to look like to make the world a genuinely better place and how it actually could be implemented in a fashion that would ensure that people abided by it (that is, that they learnt that it was important and why - that they were *convinced*, in other words, rather than forced to accept it). But it's still one of the most worthwhile things I've read in the past year.

Coping with the headlong fall into chaos links from Avagdu!

Barter 101:

<http://www.recessionwire.com/2009/04/30/barter-101/>

Groupthink as a Political Mental Illness:

Part 1

<http://lastfreevoice.wordpress.com/2009/06/18/groupthink-as-a-political-mental-illness-part-i/>

Part 2

<http://lastfreevoice.wordpress.com/2009/06/30/groupthink-as-a-political-mental-illness-part-ii/>

<http://www.backwoodshome.com/articles2/wolfe118.html> Preparing for civil unrest **Thanks Avagdu!**

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=why-do-we-swear> Swearing helps with pain relief. Fuck yes! **Thanks Kevin!**

Events

Not just for the UK – if you have an event you want publicised, let us know and we'll put details and linkages at the end of the show for ya!

Fifth National Forest Wood Fair - Thanks Geddonia! – A festival of Wood carving, archery woodland crafts with loads of local produce. Located at the national Forest centre in Beacon Hill, Derbyshire. For more details, check out the link:

<http://www.nationalforest.org/forest/woodland/index.php?fuseaction=home.woodfair>

R4nger5 London invasion – part 2 - 1st August – We'll be meeting up again with Avagdu and tearing round London looking to do interesting stuff. If you want to meet up on the evening before or generally want to hang out, let us know and we'll arrange something. We want to know of any cool things to go see or do on the afternoon of 31st July or at any time on the 1st August.

Outro Music

- Track 1 – **Learn!** By Smokesuit at www.podsafeaudio.com
- Track 2 – **Sicko Song** by Lucy Knisely at www.lucyknisley.com
- Track 3 – **Mancek** Track
- Rant – **Broken relationship** by Sean Kennedy

